



# Memorandum

**TO:** COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC  
PLAN TASK FORCE

**FROM:** Sal Yakubu

**SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF NORTH/MID  
NORTH AND MID COYOTE  
VALLEY PROPERTY OWNERS  
MEETING ON 12/15/04**

**DATE:** January 3, 2005

---

Approved

Date

---

**Property Owners and Representatives:**

Robert Andrews, Sylvia Bugley, Darlene Campbell, Joe Castro, Susan Chen, Jerry Conway, Roger Costa, Gail DeSmet, Gary DeSmet, Lily Dong, Tony Dong, Buzz Ereno, Al Filice, Joseph Filice, Frank Giancola, Reed Grandy, Mike Hamilton, Dan Hancock, Sharon Hoefling, William Joe, Lee Lester, Mike, Richard Nedbal, Dick Norme, Tri Pham, Garrett Rajkovich, Lillian Ruscitto, Paul Ruscitto, Annie Saso, Tim Steele, Kerry Williams, Ray Williams, Bill Wise, and Iris Wise.

**Members of CVSP Task Force:**

Dan Hancock, Ken Saso, and Steve Speno.

**San Jose City Staff Present and Consultants:**

Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Thompson (HMH), and Jim Musbach (EPS).

## **1) Welcome and Introductions:**

Salifu Yakubu, Principal Planner with the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, welcomed everyone in attendance and reviewed the agenda. He indicated that the purpose of the meeting is to give the property owners an update of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) since the last community meeting in June 2004.

## **2) Vision and Expected Outcomes and Existing Regulations and Draft Conceptual Greenbelt Strategy:**

Doug Dahlin, of the Dahlin Group, asked how many property owners have not attended Task Force meetings. A show of hands indicated that approximately ten people have never done so.

Doug summarized what has taken place since the property owner's last meeting. The June 15, 2004 community meeting covered the CVSP Vision, concept and design. On August 14, 2004, property owners were presented with an illustrative land use concept and an analysis of the composite framework. The staff gave the City Council a progress report on September 21, 2004 that outlined the Environmental Footprint and the Composite Infrastructure Framework for Coyote Valley. On September 28, 2004, land use principles and proposals were explained at the fifth community meeting. The public realm and planning areas A-M were discussed at the November 8, 2004 Task Force meeting. On December 9, 2004, South Coyote Valley Greenbelt property owners were presented with the Greenbelt Strategy.

Jim Thompson, with HMM Engineering, discussed the infrastructure elements, composite core infrastructure analysis and the financing of public improvements. Jim Musbach, with Economic Planning Systems (EPS), explained the funding principles, including infrastructure financing issues, and the infrastructure cost allocation and feasibility analysis. He indicated that the next steps for financing include: finalizing the land use plan and infrastructure program, allocating cost burdens, testing feasibility and making adjustments, establishing methodology for public and dedication and compensation, and developing a detailed financing and implementation program.

Sal asked for questions and comments, and received the following from the audience:

### **(a) General**

- Question regarding the projected date of annexation. *Sal indicated that the completed CVSP would go to the City Council for approval in December 2005. The staff would then work with LAFCO for approximately one year to expand the urban service area boundary. The projected date of annexation is the end of 2006 or early 2007.*
- Question regarding surrounding entities. *Sal indicated that the Plan has an aggressive outreach policy. He explained that the City is working with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the Morgan Hill School District (MHUSD) and the City of*

*Morgan Hill. Sal said that the MHUSD and City of Morgan Hill have representatives on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Task Force. Laurel stated that the City is committed to see the Plan through to its completion.*

- *Doug indicated that growth in California is inevitable. He explained that without the CVSP, future growth would create sprawl. The Plan accommodates more people, supports urban consolidation and preserves open space.*
- *Recommend that the CVSP be pitched regionally and nationally to attract people and businesses. Doug agreed and stated that this would create a valuable environment and attract job providers. Laurel indicated that the City is already pitching the CVSP.*

#### **(b) Conceptual Land Uses and Building Types**

- *Question regarding the planning area letters. Doug indicated the letters are arbitrary and do not represent phasing.*
- *Question as to when Fisher Creek restoration would begin. Doug explained that restoration is dependent upon the phasing plan.*
- *Question as to the location of the high school. Doug stated that the high school is in planning area I.*
- *Question as to whether an acre with high density would be built at the same rate as an acre with low density. Doug responded in the negative. An acre with a high-rise would have more value and demand.*

#### **(c) Infrastructure Elements**

- *Question regarding estimated costs. Doug explained that since the plan is continually changing, costs are also changing. Discussions about infrastructure costs and feasibility will take place at the January 10, 2005 Task Force meeting.*
- *Question regarding potential residential developers. Doug indicated that they include Schott, Siemas, Signature and Shapell.*
- *Question as to when development would take place. Sal indicated that existing approval for development could go forward. He noted that the Bailey Avenue interchange is part of the Coyote Valley Research Park, not CVSP. The CVSP would be completed in December 2005, and would include implementation and phasing elements.*
- *Concern regarding current construction at Santa Teresa Boulevard and Bailey Avenue. Doug indicated that the construction is not associated with the CVSP. The current property owner is raising his property out of the flood plain.*
- *Question as to whether Palm Avenue or Santa Teresa Boulevard would be widened. Doug stated that Palm Avenue would not be widened beyond two lanes, and that it ultimately would not connect to Monterey Road. Traffic would be discouraged on Santa Teresa Boulevard, and would be focused on Highway 101 and Monterey Road.*
- *Concern that Palm Avenue and Santa Teresa Boulevard would not be widened. Jim Musbach indicated that a traffic analysis would be completed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Doug explained that there would not be any wide streets in neighborhoods.*

- Concern regarding the removal of traffic signals on Monterey Road. *Doug indicated that there would be turn-backs about every quarter mile to allow drivers to turn around. He explained that the removal of signals would decrease the amount traffic at intersections and would be traffic calming.*
- Question regarding truck restrictions. *Doug explained that land use would determine where heavy vehicles are permitted. He noted that the Coyote Valley would have campus industrial areas, not heavy industrial.*
- Question as to whether the Bailey Avenue interchange would be ramp metered. *Doug explained that the State requires ramp metering at all new ramps. There would be three lanes per ramp, one of which is a bypass lane. The State policy does not allow ramp metering to impact adjacent local roads.*
- Question as to whether Bailey Over the Hill is part of the Plan. *Sal explained that this would be analyzed in the EIR.*

#### **(d) Funding Principles**

- Concern regarding property owner fees. *Jim Musbach explained that developers would pay for fees associated with developed land.*
- Question regarding bonds and assessment. *Jim Musbach indicated fees would only incur if property owners use urban services or if they develop their land.*
- Indication that no one is forcing property owners to place bonds on their property unless they are interested and willing.
- Question as to if and when tax rates would be affected. *Jim Musbach indicated that there would be a special tax if property owners entered into a community facilities district. He explained that this is a way to receive tax exempt financing rather than through fees. Any change in taxes must go through district voter approval.*
- Question as to what is meant by the 37 percent land dedication towards public facilities. *Jim Musbach explained that the 37 percent represents land converted from private to public usage.*
- Concern regarding the feasibility of the Plan. *Jim Musbach stated that in the event of an imbalance between revenue and costs, consultants would work on both ends to create a balance. He explained that the Plan would adjust as it evolves.*
- Question regarding revenue. *Laurel Prevetti explained that revenue goes towards the City's general fund and is not distributed to a specific area. She hopes that Coyote Valley would be financially self-sustaining.*
- Identify sources of outside financing. *Doug indicated that the Coyote Valley Park interchange received financing from the Highway Transportation Fund. Palm Avenue could receive funding from the grade separation fund. He also mentioned potential financing from a water purveyor for water system improvements and the regional trails fund.*

### **3) Other Comments and Questions/Adjourn:**

Sal thanked everyone for their comments and indicated that the next community meeting will take place on Thursday, January 6, 2005 at the Southside Community Center. The next Task Force meeting will be on Monday, January 10, 2005 and will discuss infrastructure costs and financial feasibility.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

\\Pbce005\CoyoteValley\_SpecificPlan\CVSP Mtgs\_TASKFORCE\Meeting  
Summary\TF27\TaskForce\_Meeting#27\_12.15.04 NorthMidMeeting.doc